arXiv:1207.2302v2 [hep-th] 11 Jul 2012

Path Integral Quantization of the First Order Einstein-Hilbert Action from its Canonical Structure

Farrukh Chishtie[1] and D.G.C. McKeon[1,2]

[1]Department of Applied Mathematics, The University of Western Ontario,
London, ON N6A 5B7, Canada
[2]Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Algoma University, Sault
St.Marie, ON P6A 2G4, Canada

July 12, 2012

Abstract

We consider the form of the path integral that follows from canonical quantization and apply it to the first order form of the Einstein-Hilbert action in $d > 2$ dimensions. We show that this is inequivalent to what is obtained from applying the Faddeev-Popov (FP) procedure directly. Due to the presence of tertiary first class constraints, the measure of the path integral is found to have a substantially different structure from what arises in the FP approach. In addition, the presence of second class constraints leads to non-trivial ghosts, which cannot be absorbed into the normalization of the path integral. The measure of the path integral lacks manifest covariance.

Keywords: Palatini action; path intgeral

1 Introduction

When quantizing the Yang-Mills model of non-Abelian vector gauge Bosons, the Faddeev-Popov (FP) procedure [1] provides a way of maintaining manifest Lorentz covariance. However, this approach to quantization is not obviously equivalent to canonical quantizations. It is only by showing that the path integral which follows from canonical quantization is in fact the same as the one that follows from the FP approach can this equivalence be established [2, 3].

When confronted with the problem of using the path integral to quantize the first order Einstein-Hilbert (1EH) action (often credited to Palatini [4], but in fact due to Einstein [5]), it is tempting to simply use the FP procedure. The demonstration in ref. [6] that the two path integrals are equivalent relies on a canonical analysis of the 1EH action that does not involve tertiary constraints– though such constraints are necessary if one is to generate the diffeomorphism transformations that involve second derivatives. An analysis of the canonical structure of the 1EH action that reveals the presence of these tertiary first class constraints (as well as second class constraints) appears in refs. [7, 8].

The 1EH is of particular interest, as the interaction term in the action is just cubic in the independent fields (the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the affine connection $\Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}$). In contrast, when using the second order Einstein-Hilbert (2EH) action, the interactions are an infinite series in $g_{\mu\nu}$ [9, 10]; this considerably complicates the Feynman rules [6, 11]. (A simplification of the Feynman rules also occurs when using the first order form of the action for Yang-Mills theory [12].)

We shall employ the form of the path integral that follows from the canonical quantization procedure [13], but treat the constraints that arise in the 1EH action in a non-standard way. The usual way of handling first class constraints appears in ref. [2]; this approach is adapted to deal with second class constraints in refs. [14, 15].

In this paper, the "second class" constraints must first be treated in an unusual way, as the "first class" constraints are only determined by considering a "reduced" action derived by using these second class constraints to eliminate fields from the 1EH action. The 1EH action can be recovered from this reduced action within the path integral formalism provided a functional determinant contributes to the measure of the path integral which is distinct from the usual function determinant arising from second class constraints [14, 15].

For the first class constraints, we employ a technique that is adapted to the path integral in phase space from the FP approach to the path integral in configuration space for models possessing a gauge invariance [16]. That is, we integrate over "gauge orbits" that are generated by the first class constraints in the theory. This approach allows us to employ a gauge fixing that is covariant. The original approach in ref. [2] to quantize models containing first class constraints through use of the path integral requires an extension [17] in order to deal with covariant gauge fixing when working in phase space.

In the following section we review the canonical structure of this action and in the third section, we describe how to quantize the 1EH action using the path integral. In Appendix A, we give a general discussion of the path integral for constrained systems.

2 The Canonical Structure of the First Order Einstein-Hilbert Action

The canonical structure of the 1EH action has been analyzed in refs. [7, 8] following the Dirac constraint procedure [18]. In this section, we review the approach detailed in ref. [7] for obtaining this canonical structure.

The Lagrangian in d dimensions is

$$\mathcal{L}_d = h^{\mu\nu}\left(G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu,\lambda} + \frac{1}{d-1}G^{\lambda}_{\lambda\mu}G^{\sigma}_{\sigma\nu} - G^{\lambda}_{\sigma\mu}G^{\sigma}_{\lambda\nu}\right) \tag{1}$$

where $h^{\mu\nu}$ and $G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}$ are related to the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the affine connection $\Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}$ through

$$h^{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{-g}\, g^{\mu\nu} \qquad (\det h^{\mu\nu} = -(-g)^{-1+d/2}) \tag{2}$$

$$G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} = \Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^{\lambda}_{\mu}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\sigma\nu} + \delta^{\lambda}_{\nu}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\sigma\mu}\right). \tag{3}$$

The infinitesimal form of the diffeomorphism invariance present in $\mathcal{L}_d$ is

$$\delta h^{\mu\nu} = h^{\mu\lambda}\partial_{\lambda}\theta^{\nu} + h^{\nu\lambda}\partial_{\lambda}\theta^{\mu} - \partial_{\lambda}(h^{\mu\nu}\theta^{\lambda}) \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} = {}& -\partial^2_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^{\lambda}_{\mu}\partial_{\nu} + \delta^{\lambda}_{\nu}\partial_{\mu}\right)\partial\cdot\theta - \theta\cdot\partial G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} \\ & + G^{\rho}_{\mu\nu}\partial_{\rho}\theta^{\lambda} - \left(G^{\lambda}_{\mu\rho}\partial_{\nu} + G^{\lambda}_{\nu\rho}\partial_{\mu}\right)\theta^{\rho}.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The Lagrangian is now expressed in terms of variables that simplifies the canonical analysis. We initially take

$$h = h^{00}, \quad h^i = h^{0i}, \quad H^{ij} = hh^{ij} - h^i h^j \tag{6, 7, 8}$$

and

$$\pi = -G^0_{00}, \quad \pi_i = -2G^0_{0i}, \quad \pi_{ij} = -G^0_{ij} \tag{9, 10, 11}$$

$$\xi^i = -G^i_{00}, \quad \xi^i_j = -2G^i_{0j}, \quad \xi^i_{jk} = -G^i_{jk}. \tag{12, 13, 14}$$

We then set

$$\pi_{ij} = h\Pi_{ij} \tag{15}$$

$$\pi_i = \Pi_i - 2\Pi_{ij}h^j \tag{16}$$

$$\pi = \Pi + \frac{\Pi_{ij}}{h}(H^{ij} + h^i h^j) \tag{17}$$

$$\overline{\xi}^i = \xi^i - \xi^i_{jk}h^{jk}/h \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\xi^i_j = {}& \overline{\zeta}^i_j - \frac{2}{h}\left(\xi^i_{jk} - \frac{1}{d-1}\delta^i_j\xi^{\ell}_{\ell k}\right)h^k \\ & + \delta^i_j\left(\overline{t} - \frac{1}{d-1}\frac{2}{h}\xi^{\ell}_{\ell k}h^k\right) \quad (\overline{\zeta}^i_i = 0)\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_d = {}& \Pi h_{,0} + \Pi_i h^i_{,0} + \Pi_{ij}H^{ij}_{,0} + \overline{\xi}^i\chi_i + \overline{t}\chi \\ & + \frac{2-d}{d-1}\Big[h\Pi^2 + h^i\Pi\Pi_i + \frac{1}{4h}(H^{ij} + h^i h^j)\Pi_i\Pi_j\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{h}(H^{ij}H^{k\ell}+H^{ik}h^j h^\ell)\Pi_{ij}\Pi_{k\ell}\\
&+\frac{1}{h}(h^i H^{k\ell}-H^{ik}h^\ell)\Pi_i\Pi_{k\ell}+2H^{ij}\Pi\,\Pi_{ij}\Big]\\
&+\overline{\zeta}^i_j\left(h^j_{,i}-\frac{1}{2}h^j\Pi_i-H^{jk}\Pi_{ik}\right)-\frac{h}{4}\overline{\zeta}^i_j\overline{\zeta}^j_i\\
&+\xi^i_{jk}\left[\frac{1}{h}H^{jk}_{,i}-\frac{1}{h}H^{jk}\Pi_i+\frac{1}{2(d-1)h}(\delta^j_i H^{k\ell}+\delta^k_i H^{j\ell})\right.\\
&\left.(\Pi_\ell-2h^m\Pi_{\ell m})+\frac{1}{h}(h^j H^{kp}+h^k H^{jp})\Pi_{ip}\right]\\
&+\frac{1}{h}H^{ij}\left(\frac{1}{d-1}\xi^k_{ki}\xi^\ell_{\ell j}-\xi^k_{\ell i}\xi^\ell_{kj}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$\chi_i = h_{,i} - h\Pi_i \tag{21}$$

and

$$\chi = h^i_{,i} + h\Pi. \tag{22}$$

From this form of $\mathcal{L}_d$, we see that the canonical momenta conjugate to Π, Π_i and Π_{ij} all vanish while the canonical momenta conjugate to h, h^i and H^{ij} are Π, Π_i and Π_{ij} respectively. These momenta constitute $d(d-1)$ primary second class constraints on these variables. The momenta conjugate to $\overline{\xi}^i$, $\overline{t}$, $\overline{\zeta}^i_j$ and ξ^i_{jk} also vanish; these are the primary constraints

$$\mathbb{P}_i = \mathbb{P} = \overline{\mathbb{P}}^j_i = \mathbb{P}^{jk}_i = 0 \tag{23a - d}$$

respectively. (We note that since $\overline{\zeta}^i_i = 0$, we take

$$\left\{\overline{\zeta}^i_j(\vec{r},t),\ \ \overline{\mathbb{P}}^\ell_k(\vec{r}',t)\right\} = \left(\delta^i_k\delta^\ell_j - \frac{1}{d-1}\delta^i_j\delta^\ell_k\right)\delta^{d-1}(\vec{r}-\vec{r}').) \tag{24}$$

As the form of $\mathcal{L}_d$ is $p_i\dot{q}^i - H_c$, one can immediately read off the canonical Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_c$ from eq. (20). We find that the constraints $\mathbb{P}_i = \mathbb{P} = 0$ lead to the secondary constraints

$$\chi_i = \chi = 0 \tag{25a, b}$$

while $\overline{\mathbb{P}}^j_i = \mathbb{P}^{jk}_i = 0$ lead to

$$\overline{\zeta}^i_j = \frac{2}{h}\left(\lambda^i_j - \frac{1}{d-1}\delta^i_j\lambda^k_k\right) \tag{26}$$

$$\xi^i_{jk} = -\frac{1}{2}(M^{-1})^{i\ \ \ \ell}_{jk\ mn}\sigma^{mn}_\ell \tag{27}$$

where

$$\lambda^j_i = h^j_{,i} - \frac{1}{2}h^j\Pi_i - H^{jk}\Pi_{ik} \tag{28}$$

$$\sigma_i^{jk} = \frac{1}{h}H^{jk}_{,i} - \frac{1}{h}H^{jk}\Pi_i + \frac{1}{2(d-1)h}\left(\delta_i^j H^{k\ell} + \delta_i^k H^{j\ell}\right)\left(\Pi_\ell - 2h^m\Pi_{\ell m}\right)$$
$$+\frac{1}{h}\left(h^j H^{kp} + h^k H^{jp}\right)\Pi_{ip} \tag{29}$$

and

$$(M^{-1})^{x}_{yz}{}^{k}_{\ell m} = -\frac{h}{2}\Bigg[\left(H_{\ell y}\delta_z^k\delta_m^x + H_{my}\delta_z^k\delta_\ell^x + H_{\ell z}\delta_y^k\delta_m^x + H_{mz}\delta_y^k\delta_\ell^x\right) \tag{30}$$
$$+\frac{2}{d-2}\left(H^{kx}H_{\ell m}H_{yz}\right) - H^{kx}\left(H_{\ell z}H_{my} + H_{mz}H_{\ell y}\right)\Bigg].$$

Eqs. (23c,d) and (26,27) obviously constitute a set of $d(d^2-3)$ second class constraints. The secondary constraints of eqs. (25a,b) do not have vanishing PB with those of eqs. (26,27). However, this does not mean that all these constraints are second class. We take the constraints of eqs. (23c,d) and (26,27) to be second class and use them to eliminate the fields $\overline{\zeta}^i_j$ and ξ^i_{jk} from $\mathcal{H}_c$. (The Dirac Brackets that replace the Poisson Brackets are identical to the Poisson Brackets for the variables that are left after this replacement [7].) The resulting expression for $\mathcal{H}_c$ is

$$\mathcal{H}_c = \frac{1}{h}(\tau + h^i\tau_i) + \frac{3}{2(d-2)}\,\frac{1}{h^2}H^{k\ell}_{,i}H_{k\ell}H^{ij}\chi_j \tag{31}$$
$$-\frac{3d-5}{4(d-2)}\,\frac{1}{h^3}H^{ij}\chi_i\chi_j - \frac{3}{h^2}H^{ij}\chi_i\Pi_j - \left(\frac{1}{h^2}H^{ij}\chi_i\right)_{,j}$$
$$+\frac{2}{h^2}H^{ij}_{,i}\chi_j + \frac{h^i}{h}\chi_{,i} - \frac{1}{h^2}h^i h^j_{,i}\chi_j - 2\left(\frac{d-2}{d-1}\right)\frac{1}{h}H^{mn}\Pi_{mn}\chi$$
$$-\frac{1}{h}h^i\Pi\chi_i - \frac{H^{mn}\Pi_{mn}}{h^2}h^i\chi_i - \frac{2}{h^2}h^k H^{ij}\Pi_{ik}\chi_j$$
$$+\frac{d-3}{d-1}\Pi\chi + \frac{1}{d-1}\,\frac{\chi^2}{h} - \frac{1}{d-1}\,\frac{1}{h}h^i\Pi_i\chi - \overline{\xi}^i\chi_i - \overline{t}\chi$$

where

$$\tau = H^{ij}_{,ij} - \frac{1}{2}H^{mi}_{,n}H_{ij}H^{nj}_{,m} - \frac{1}{4}H^{ij}H_{mn,i}H^{mn}_{,j} \tag{32}$$
$$-\frac{1}{4(d-1)}H^{ij}H_{k\ell}H^{k\ell}_{,i}H_{mn}H^{mn}_{,j} + H^{ij}H^{k\ell}\left(\Pi_{ij}\Pi_{k\ell} - \Pi_{ik}\Pi_{j\ell}\right)$$

and

$$\tau_i = -2(H^{mn}\Pi_{mi})_{,n} + H^{mn}\Pi_{mn,i} + (H^{mn}\Pi_{mn})_{,i}. \tag{33}$$

(Eqs. (32,33) correct misprints in eqs. (46, 47) of ref. [7].)

With the Hamiltonian of eq. (31), we find that $(\mathbb{P}_i, \mathbb{P})$, (χ_i, χ) and (τ_i, τ) are all first class constraints of the first, second and third generation respectively; the only non vanishing Poisson Brackets for these constraints are

$$\{\chi_i, \chi\} = \chi_i \tag{34}$$

$$\{\tau_i(\vec{x}), \tau_j(\vec{y})\} = \left(-\tau_i(\vec{y})\partial_j^x + \tau_j(\vec{x})\partial_i^y\right)\delta^{d-1}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) \tag{35}$$

$$\{\tau(\vec{x}), \tau(\vec{y})\} = \left(\partial_i^x H^{ij}(\vec{y})\tau_j(\vec{y}) - \partial_j^y H^{ij}(\vec{x})\tau_i(\vec{x})\right)\delta^{d-1}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}) \tag{36}$$

and

$$\{\tau_i(\vec{x}), \tau(\vec{y})\} = \left(-\partial_i^x\tau(\vec{y}) + \partial_i^y\tau(\vec{x})\right)\delta^{d-1}(\vec{x}-\vec{y}). \tag{37}$$

From these first class constraints, the generator of the gauge transformations that leave the action in phase space invariant, either by using the approach of HTZ [20, 21] or C [22, 23]. In the HTZ approach, the form of the generator G for a transformation $\delta\Phi = \{\Phi, G\}$ is

$$G = \int d^{d-1}x[\lambda^{a_i}\phi_{a_i}] \tag{38}$$

where ϕ_{a_i} is the set of first class constraints of the i^{th} generation ($i = 1 \ldots N$). This generator satisfies equation [20]

$$\int d^{d-1}x\left[\frac{D\lambda^{a_i}}{Dt}\phi_{a_i} + \{G, H_c + U^{a_i}\phi_{a_i}\} - \delta U^{a_i}\phi_{a_i}\right] = 0 \tag{39}$$

where D/Dt denotes a derivative with respect to time exclusive of dependence through the dynamical fields. For the 1EH action we have

$$G = \int d^{d-1}x\left[a\mathbb{P} + a^i\mathbb{P}_i + b\chi + b^i\chi_i + c\tau + c^i\tau_i\right]. \tag{40}$$

Taking c and c^i to be exclusively functions of t, then eq. (39) is satisfied at order τ and τ_i respectively provided

$$c_{,0} + \frac{b}{h} + \frac{(c^i h)_{,i}}{h^2} - \frac{c h^i_{,i}}{h} + \frac{(ch)_{,i}h^i}{h^2} = 0 \tag{41}$$

and

$$c^i_{,0} + \frac{h^i}{h}b + b^i - \frac{H^{ij}}{h^2}(ch)_{,j} + c^i_{,j}\frac{h^j}{h} - c^j\left(\frac{h^i}{h}\right)_{,j} = 0. \tag{42}$$

These equations fix b and b^i in terms of c and c^i. In principle, the coefficients of χ and χ_i in eq. (39) determine a and a^i while the coefficients of $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}_i$ fix δU^{a_i}. However, as $\mathcal{H}_c$ in eq. (31) is quadratic in χ and χ_i, a and a^i are not fixed uniquely by this procedure. However, to compute δh, δh^i and δH^{ij} it is adequate to have b and b^i in terms of c and c^i. We find that

$$\delta h = \{h, G\} = \left\{h, \int d^{d-1}x(b\chi)\right\} = -h^2 c_{,0} - (hc)_{,j}h^j + ch\, h^j_{,j} - (hc^j)_{,j} \tag{43}$$

$$\delta h^i = \{h^i, G\} = \left\{h^i, \int d^{d-1}x(b^j\chi_j)\right\} = hc^i_{,0} - h^i h c_{,0} + h^i c h^j_{,j} \tag{44}$$

$$-\frac{h^i(hc^j)_{,j}}{h} - (ch)_{,j}h^{ij} + c^i_{,j}h^j - c^j h^i_{,j} + \frac{c^j h^i h_{,j}}{h}$$

and

$$\delta H^{ij} = \{H^{ij}, G\} = \left\{ H^{ij}, \int d^{d-1}x(c\tau + c^k\tau_k) \right\} \tag{45}$$
$$= 2(H^{ij}H^{k\ell} - H^{ik}H^{j\ell})\Pi_{k\ell}c + (H^{ik}c^j_{,k} + H^{jk}c^i_{,k}) - (H^{ij}c^k)_{,k} - c^k_{,k}H^{ij}.$$

(Eqs. (43, 45) correct mistakes in eqs. (85, 87) of ref. [7].) Eqs. (43, 44) are consistent with eq. (4) provided $\theta = -hc$ and $\theta^i = c^i - h^i c$. However, for eq. (45) to be consistent with eq. (4) with these relationships between (θ, θ^i) and (c, c^i) we must eliminate $\Pi_{k\ell}$ in eq. (45) using the equations of motion

$$\dot{H}_{ij} = \left\{ H_{ij}, \int d^{d-1}x \mathcal{H}_c \right\} = \left\{ \int H_{ij}, \int d^{d-1}x \left(\frac{1}{h}\right)(\tau + h^i\tau_i) \right\} \tag{46}$$
$$= \frac{2}{h}(H^{ij}H^{k\ell} - H^{ik}H^{j\ell})\Pi_{k\ell}$$
$$+ \left[H^{ik}\left(\frac{h^j}{h}\right)_{,k} + H^{jk}\left(\frac{h^i}{h}\right)_{,k} \right]$$
$$- \left(H^{ij}\frac{h^k}{h}\right)_{,k} - \left(\frac{h^k}{h}\right)_{,k} H^{ij}$$

and

$$\chi = \chi_i = 0. \tag{47}$$

Upon applying these on-shell conditions, we find (just as in ref. [28]) that eq. (51) is consistent with eq. (4). We have not pursued the question of how $\delta G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} = \{G^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu}, G\}$ is related to eq. (5).

The method C [22, 23] can also be used to find the generator of the gauge transformation in phase space associated with the 1EH action, as was considered in ref. [8]. In this approach,

$$G = \epsilon G_0 + \dot{\epsilon} G_1 + \ddot{\epsilon} G_2 \tag{48}$$

with G_A determined by the chain

$$G_2 \approx \text{primary} \tag{49}$$
$$G_1 + \{G_2, H_T\} \approx \text{primary}$$
$$G_0 + \{G_1, H_T\} \approx \text{primary}$$
$$\{G_0, H_T\} \approx \text{primary}.$$

One begins with either $G_2 = \mathbb{P}$ or $G_2 = \mathbb{P}_i$ and then in both cases, finds the resulting expressions for G_1 and G_0 from eq. (49). This however, is not a unique process as $\mathcal{H}_c$ in eq. (31) is quadratic in χ and χ_i. Furthermore, as was pointed out in ref. [22], the gauge transformation generated by this G is equivalent to a diffeomorphism (eqs. (4,5)) only on shell.

3 The Path Integral in Phase Space for the First Order Einstein-Hilbert Action

In this section we will show how the action of eq. (1) can be quantized using the path integral whose general form is given by eq. (A.21). The action for which we have the gauge invariance in phase space given by eqs. (43-45) is associated with the Hamiltonian of eq. (31). However, this Hamiltonian is found by eliminating the fields $\overline{\zeta}^i_j$ and ξ^i_{jk} from the original Hamiltonian implied by eq. (20) using eqs. (26, 27). As discussed after eq. (30), we can classify the constraints of eqs. (23a, 23b, 25a, 25b, 32, 33) as being first class only after $\overline{\zeta}^i_j$, ξ^i_{jk} have been eliminated using eqs. (26, 27). Consequently it is appropriate to use the path integral of eq. (A.9) to quantize our action only if "H_T" is identified with the total Hamiltonian associated with the Hamiltonian of eq. (31).

Eqs. (26, 27) arise from those parts of the Lagrangian of eq. (20) of the form

$$Q_A f_A - \frac{1}{2} Q_A M_{AB} Q_B; \tag{50}$$

so that with

$$Q_A = M^{-1}_{AB} f_B \tag{51}$$

these terms become contributions to the Hamiltonian of eq. (31) of the form

$$-\frac{1}{2} f_A M^{-1}_{AB} f_B. \tag{52}$$

Upon using the equation

$$e^{\frac{1}{2} f_A M^{-1}_{AB} f_B} = \left(\frac{\det M_{AB}}{(2\pi)^n}\right)^{1/2} \int D^n Q_A e^{Q_A f_A - \frac{1}{2} Q_A M_{AB} Q_B} \tag{53}$$

it is apparent that $\overline{\zeta}^i_j$ and $\overline{\xi}^i_{jk}$ can be restored into the action and that we can use eq. (20) provided the contributions of $(\det M_{AB})^{1/2}$ coming from eqs. (26, 27) are included in the measure of the path integral. These determinants are

$$D_1(h) = \det \left[h \left(\delta^\ell_i \delta^j_k - \frac{1}{d-1} \delta^j_i \delta^\ell_k \right) \right] \tag{54}$$

(coming from $-\frac{h}{4} \overline{\zeta}^i_j \overline{\zeta}^j_i$ in eq. (20)) and

$$\begin{aligned} D_2(H^{ij}/h) = \det \Bigg[\frac{1}{h} \Bigg(& \frac{1}{d-1} \left(\delta^j_i \delta^m_\ell H^{kn} + \delta^k_i \delta^m_\ell H^{jn} + \delta^j_i \delta^n_\ell H^{km} + \delta^k_i \delta^n_\ell H^{jm} \right) \\ & - \left(\delta^j_\ell \delta^m_i H^{kn} + \delta^k_\ell \delta^m_i H^{jn} + \delta^j_\ell \delta^n_i H^{km} + \delta^k_\ell \delta^n_i H^{jm} \right) \Bigg) \Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

(coming from $\frac{H^{ij}}{h} \left(\frac{1}{d-1} \xi^k_{ki} \xi^\ell_{\ell j} - \xi^k_{\ell i} \xi^\ell_{kj} \right)$ in eq. (20)).

Having the gauge invariances of eqs. (43-45) requires introduction of a factor of the form of eq. (A.10) into the path integral to remove the divergence arising from the "overcounting" of gauge-equivalent field configurations. The gauge fixing term

$$\psi^\nu = \partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu} \tag{56}$$

is commonly used; it becomes using eqs. (6-8)

$$\psi^0 = \dot{h} + \partial_i h^i \tag{57}$$

$$\psi^i = \dot{h}^i + \left(\frac{H^{ij} + h^i h^j}{h}\right)_{,j} . \tag{58}$$

The results of eqs. (43-45) show that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{\psi^0, G\right\} = {} & \left(-h^2 c_{,0} - (hc)_{,j} h^j + c\,h\,h^j_{,j} - (hc^j)_{,j}\right)_{,0} \\ & + \Big(hc^i_{,0} - h^i h c_{,0} + h^i c h^j_{,j} - \frac{1}{h} h^i (hc^j)_{,j} - (ch)_{,j} h^{ij} \\ & \qquad + c^i_{,j} h^j - c^j h^i_{,j} + \frac{1}{h} c^j h^i h_{,j}\Big)_{,i}\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{\psi^j, G\right\} = {} & \Big(hc^i_{,0} - h^i h c_{,0} + h^i c h^j_{,j} - \frac{1}{h} h^i (hc^j)_{,j} - (ch)_{,j} h^{ij} \\ & \qquad + c^i_{,j} h^j - c^j h^i_{,j} + \frac{1}{h} c^j h^i h_{,j}\Big)_{,0} \\ & + \frac{1}{h}\bigg(2(H^{ij}H^{k\ell} - H^{ik}H^{j\ell})\Pi_{k\ell} c + (H^{ik} c^j_{,k} + H^{jk} c^i_{,k}) \\ & \qquad - (H^{ij} c^k)_{,k} - c^k_{,k} H^{ij}\bigg)_{,j} \\ & + \frac{h^i}{h}\Big(hc^j_{,0} - h^j h c_{,0} + h^j c h^k_{,k} - \frac{1}{h} h^j (hc^k)_{,k} - (ch)_{,k} h^{jk} \\ & \qquad + c^j_{,k} h^k - c^k h^j_{,k} + \frac{1}{h} c^k h^j h_{,k}\Big)_{,j} \\ & + \frac{h^j}{h}\Big(hc^i_{,0} - h^i h c_{,0} + h^i c h^k_{,k} - \frac{1}{h} h^i (hc^k)_{,k} - (ch)_{,k} h^{ik} \\ & \qquad + c^i_{,k} h^k - c^k h^i_{,k} + \frac{1}{h} c^k h^i h_{,k}\Big)_{,j} \\ & - \frac{H^{ij} + h^i h^j}{h^2}\left(-h^2 c_{,0} - (hc)_{,k} h^k + c\,h\,h^k_{,k} - (hc^k)_{,k}\right)_{,j} .\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

The functional integral over μ_{a_N} in eq. (A.10) (identifying μ_{a_N} with c and c^k) gives rise to the determinant Δ, since

$$\int d^4x\, \delta(\mathbf{A}\vec{x} + \vec{b}) = (|\det \mathbf{A}|)^{-1}. \tag{61}$$

As

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \int d^n\gamma d^n\overline{\gamma} \exp(\overline{\gamma}^T \mathbf{A}\gamma) \tag{62}$$

using Grassmann fields $\overline{\gamma}$, γ, we see that the contribution of eq. (59) to Δ can be exponentiated to give

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^{(1)} = \int D\overline{\gamma}^\lambda D\gamma^\lambda \exp i \int dx \Big\{ & -\overline{\gamma}^0_{,0} \left[-h^2\gamma^0_{,0} - (h\gamma^0)_{,j}h^j + \gamma^0 h\, h^j_{,j} - (h\gamma^j)_{,j}\right] \\ & - \overline{\gamma}^0_{,i} \Big[h\gamma^i_{,0} - h^i h\gamma^0_{,0} + h^i\gamma^0 h^j_{,j} - \frac{1}{h}h^i(h\gamma^j)_{,j} - (\gamma^0 h)_{,j}h^{ij} \\ & -\gamma^i_{,j}h^j - \gamma^j h^i_{,j} + \frac{1}{h}\gamma^j h^i h_{,j}\Big]\Big\}\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

with $\Delta^{(2)}$, coming from eq. (60), being exponentiated in exactly the same manner; we have $\Delta = \Delta^{(1)}\Delta^{(2)}$. All together then, the path integral of eq. (A.14) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}< \mathrm{out}|\mathrm{in} > = \int & Dh\, Dh^i\, DH^{ij}\, D\Pi\, D\Pi_i\, D\Pi_{ij}\, D\overline{\xi}^i\, D\overline{t}\, D\overline{\zeta}^i_j D\xi^i_{jk} \\ & \left(D_1(h)D_2(H^{ij})\right)^{1/2} \quad \Delta \quad \exp i \int d^dx \left(\mathcal{L}_d - \frac{1}{2\alpha}(\partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu})^2\right)\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

with $\mathcal{L}_d$ being given by eq. (20).

One can now revert back to the variables $h^{\mu\nu}$, $G^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$ in place of these that appear in eq. (64) as these two sets of variables are canonically equivalent. This results in $\mathcal{L}_d$ being expressed in the form of eq. (1) rather than eq. (20). The determinants D_1, D_2, $\Delta^{(1)}$ and $\Delta^{(2)}$ are similarly expressed in terms of $h^{\mu\nu}$, $G^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$.

We note that since $\mathcal{L}_d$ (both in eq. (20) and eq. (1)) is already in "Hamiltonian form" (viz of the form $p\dot{q} - H$) it is not necessary to employ the technique outlined in eqs. (A.14-22) to eliminate the path integral over momenta and obtain the configuration space form of the path integral.

4 Discussion

By having started with the canonical structure of the 1EH action [7, 8] , found by using the Dirac constraint formalism [18], we have been able to quantize this model using the quantum mechanical path integral. The result is different from what is obtained using the FP approach [6]. This is because of the presence of the determinants D_1, D_2 and Δ in eq. (64). Both D_1 and D_2 arise because of "second class" constraints in the theory, though they are second class only in the sense that the first class constraints are so classified only after these second class constraints have been used to remove the fields ξ^i_{jk} and $\overline{\zeta}^i_j$ from the action; D_1 and D_2 arise when restoring these variables. The determinant Δ arises through breaking of the gauge invariance present in the phase space form of the total action by virtue of the 3d first class constraints present in the theory. It is distinct from the usual FP determinant.

Although the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_d$ is manifestly covariant, neither these determinants nor the gauge choice $\partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu}$ have this property. The determinants D_1 and D_2 are not covariant, as their form arises upon a particular choice of a "time" coordinate; this is an inevitable feature of any canonical analysis. The determinant Δ is not covariant as the generator G does not generate an infinitesimal diffeomorphism transformation in $h^{\mu\nu}$, but rather a transformation that becomes a diffeomorphism only if the gauge functions have a non-covariant field dependence and the equations of motion are satisfied (see the discussion following eq. (45)). The gauge fixing term in eq. (64), $(\partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu})^2$, is not covariant, but the choice of gauge fixing ψ in eq. (A.10) should be arbitrary.

It is not clear if Green's functions computed using eq. (A.10) would be manifestly covariant. For Yang-Mills theory [16], quantization in phase space leads the same generating functional as is found by employing the FP approach, as in the Yang-Mills model there are no second class constraints and the first class constraints generate the usual Yang-Mills gauge transformations without requiring field dependent gauge functions. The same is also true for the free spin two field and the 1EH action in two dimensions [16], though the same is not true for a model containing an anti-symmetric tensor field with a pseudo scalar mass term which is coupled to gauge field [19].

One generally uses the FP approach in conjunction with the configuration space form of the action in order to quantize a gauge theory in a manner consistent with manifest covariance. Although this approach leads to a path integral that is consistent with the path integral that follows from canonical quantization for Yang-Mills theory [2, 3], it is not necessarily true for any gauge theory. The argument for the equivalence of these two forms of the path integral for the 1EH action that appears in ref. [6] relies on a canonical analysis of this action that is inconsistent with the analysis of appendix

Using the generating functional of eq. (64) to find a propagator associated with these terms in the action which are bilinear in the fields is not feasible, as is discussed in refs. [6, 16]. Only by expanding $h^{\mu\nu}$ about a flat background so that

$$h^{\mu\nu} \to \eta^{\mu\nu} + h^{\mu\nu} \tag{65}$$

can a suitable propagator be found with the gauge choice $\partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu} = 0$. The expansion of eq. (65) can be done in the generating functional of eq. (64) directly. However, it may be more appropriate to do this expansion in the action of eq. (1) and then performing the canonical analysis of the resulting action. This latter course of action is non-trivial, but is currently being considered.

Acknowledgements

S. Kuzmin and N. Kiriushcheva had useful comments, as did R. Macleod.

References

[1] L.D. Faddeev and V.N. Popov, *Phys. Lett.* **B25**, 29 (1967).

[2] L.D. Faddeev, *Theor. and Math. Phys.* **1**, 1 (1970).

[3] L.D. Faddeev and A.A. Slavnov, “Gauge Fields” (Benjamin Cummings, Reading, MA 1980).

[4] M. Ferrairs, M. Francaviglia and C. Reine, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **14**, 243 (1982).

[5] A. Einstein, *Preuss. Adad. Wiss. Phys.-Math. Kl.*, 414 (1925) Arxiv. 0503046.

[6] L.D. Faddeev and V.N. Popov, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **16**, 777 (1974).

[7] D.G.C. McKeon, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A25**, 3453 (2010).

[8] S.V. Kuzmin and N. Kiriushcheva, *Central Eur. J. Phys.* **9**, 576 (2011).

[9] G. ’t Hooft and M. Veltman, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **20**, 69 (1974).

[10] D.M. Capper, G. Leibbrandt and M. Ramon-Medrano, *Phys. Rev.* **D8**, 4320 (1973).

[11] E.S. Fradkin and I.V. Tyutin, *Phys. Rev.* **D2**, 2841 (1970).

[12] D.G.C. McKeon, *Can. J. Phys.* **72**, 601 (1994).

[13] S. Weinberg, “The Quantum Theory of Fields I” (Ch. 9) (Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge 1995).

[14] E.S. Fradkin, Proceedings of the X-th Winter School of Theoretical Physics in Karpacz (1973).

[15] P. Senjanovic, *Ann. of Phys.* **100**, 227 (1976).

[16] D.G.C. McKeon, arxiv hep-th 1112.3646.

[17] E.S. Fradkin and G.A. Vilkovisky, CERN report TH-2332 (1977).

[18] P.A.M. Dirac, “Lectures on Quantum Mechanics” (Dover, Minola 2001).

[19] F. Chishtie and D.G.C. McKeon, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A27** No. 14, 1250077 (2012), arxiv 1110.1425.

[20] M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, *Nucl. Phys.* **B332**, 169 (1990).

[21] R. Banerjee, H.J. Rothe and K.D. Rothe, *Phys. Lett.* **B462**, 248 (1999); ibid **479**, 429 (2000) .

[22] L. Castellani, *Ann. of Phys.* **143**, 357 (1982).

[23] J.M. Pons, D.C. Salisbury and L.C. Shepley, *Phys. Rev.* **D55**, 659 (1997).

[24] E.S. Fradkin, "A Memorial Volume to I.E. Tamm" Nauka, Moscow 1972 pgs. 146-176.

[25] W. Garczynski, *Rep. Math. Phys.* **25**, 73 (1987).

[26] W. Garczynski, *Phys. Lett.* **B198**, 367 (1987).

[27] D.G.C. McKeon and A. Patrushev, *The European Physical Journal Plus*, Volume 126, No. 12, 131, (2011), arxiv 1009.3578.

[28] P. Bergmann and A. Komar, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **5**, 15 (1972).

Appendix A

The Path Integral for Constrained Systems

If a system has degrees of freedom $(q_i(t), p^i(t)) \quad (i = 1 \dots n)$ in phase space, and there are no constraints, then the equation of motion for a dynamical variable $A(q_i(t), p^i(t))$ is given by

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = \{A, H_c\} \tag{A.1}$$

where H_c is the usual canonical Hamiltonian associated with the Lagrangian L for the system

$$H_c(q_i, p^i) = p^i \dot{q}_i - L(q_i, \dot{q}_i). \tag{A.2}$$

Upon canonical quantization, eq. (A.1) leads to the path integral for the generating functional [13]

$$< \mathrm{out}|\mathrm{in} >= \int Dq_i\, Dp^i \exp i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt (p^i \dot{q}_i - H_c) \tag{A.3}$$

where $q_i(t) \to (q_{\mathrm{out}}, q_{\mathrm{in}})$ as $t \to \pm\infty$.

When first class constraints $\phi_a(q_i, p^i)$ are present, Faddeev [2] showed that the measure in eq. (A.3) is supplemented by a factor of

$$\det \{\phi_a, \chi_b\}\, \delta(\phi_a) \delta(\chi_a). \tag{A.4}$$

where χ_a is the gauge condition associated with ϕ_a. This was done by performing a canonical transformation to explicitly eliminate those degrees of freedom that are not truly dynamical by virtue of the constraints that are present. Senjanovic [15] extended these considerations, showing that if second class constraints θ_a are present, then the measure of eq. (A.3) receives a further supplement of

$$\det{}^{1/2} \{\theta_a, \theta_b\}\, \delta(\theta_a) \tag{A.5}$$

in addition to that of eq. (A.4). In many (but not all [19]) cases, this contribution to the measure coming from second class constraints is inconsequential.

We adopt a different approach [16] to the path integral for systems in which there are first class constraints ϕ_{a_i} where the subscript "i" denotes the generation ($i = 1$, primary; $i = 2$, secondary; $i = 3$, tertiary; $\ldots N$) of the constraint. The primary constraints ϕ_{a_i} arise from the failure to be able to solve

$$p^i = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_L} \tag{A.6}$$

for $\dot{q}_i$ in terms of q_i and p^i. In this case, we define a "total Hamiltonian" H_T

$$H_T = H_c + \lambda_{a_1}\phi_{a_1} \tag{A.7}$$

where λ_{a_1} are a set of Lagrange multipliers. The Lagrangian equations of motion are now equivalent to

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = \{A, H_T\} \tag{A.8a}$$

$$\phi_{a_1} = 0 \tag{A.8b}$$

in place of eq. (A.1). This leads to the path integral in phase space

$$< \text{out}|\text{in} >= \int Dq_i\, Dp^i\, D\lambda_{a_1} \exp i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt(p^i\dot{q}_i - H_T). \tag{A.9}$$

However, the presence of first class constraints implies the existence of a gauge invariance in the total action $S_T = \int(p^i\dot{q}_1 - H_T)$ and so the path integral in eq. (A.9) is ill defined. We adapt the FP [1] approach, which they used in conjunction with path integrals in configuration space, to factor out the integration over degrees of freedom that are gauge artifacts in the phase space path integral of eq. (A.9). This is done by first introducing a constant factor [16]

$$1 = \int D\mu_{a_N}\delta(\psi + \{\psi, G\} - k)\Delta \tag{A.10}$$

in eq. (A.9). In eq. (A.10), $\psi(q_i, \dot{q}_i)$ fixes the gauge, G is the generator of the gauge transformation that leaves S_T invariant (found by using the HTZ method [20,21], as opposed to the C method [22, 23]), k is independent of q_i, and Δ is a functional determinant (analogous to the FP determinant [1]) introduced to ensure the equality in eq. (A.10). The form of G is

$$G = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{a_i}\mu_{a_i}\phi_{a_i}(q_i, p^i); \tag{A.11}$$

we assume that the system is such that the HTZ equation [20]

$$\frac{D\mu_{a_i}}{Dt}\phi_{a_i} + \{G, H_T\} - \delta\lambda_{a_1}\phi_{a_1} = 0 \tag{A.12}$$

fixes $\mu_{a_1} \dots \mu_{a_{N-1}}$ in terms of μ_{a_N}

A further insertion of the constant

$$\int Dk \exp \frac{-i}{2\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt\, k^2 \tag{A.13}$$

into eq. (A.9) followed by a gauge transformation generated by $(-G)$ leads to

$$< \mathrm{out}|\mathrm{in} >= \int D\mu_{a_N} \int Dq_i\, Dp^i\, D\lambda_{a_1} \Delta \exp i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \left(p^i \dot{q}_i - H_T - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \psi^2 \right) \tag{A.14}$$

since the total action and Δ are gauge invariant. The integral over μ_{a_N}, which has been factored out, contains the divergence originally present in the path integral of eq. (A.9).

We now will follow the method outlined in refs. [24, 25, 26] to convert the integral in eq. (A.14) to an integral in configuration space. If the rank of the $n \times n$ Hessian matrix

$$A_r(q_i, \dot{q}_i) = \frac{\partial^2 L(q_k, \dot{q}_k)}{\partial \dot{q}_i \partial \dot{q}_j} \tag{A.15}$$

is r, then there are $n-r$ primary constraints $\phi_{a_1}(q_i, p^i)$. If we denote the first r variable with a single prime (q'_i, p'^i; $i = 1 \dots r$) and the remaining $n-r$ variables with a double prime ($q''_i, p''_i; i = r+1 \dots n$), then from eq. (A.6) for $i = 1 \dots r$

$$\dot{q}'_i = f_i(q'_j, q''_j, p'_j, \dot{q}''_j) \quad (i = 1 \dots r) \tag{A.16}$$

and

$$\phi_{a_1}(q_i, p^i) = p''^i - g^i(q'_j, q''_j, p'_j)\ (i = r+1 \dots n). \tag{A.17}$$

By using eq. (A.2), (A.16) and (A.17), eq. (A.14) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} < \mathrm{out}|\mathrm{in} >= \int Dq_i\, Dp^i \int Dv_i \delta\left(v_i - f_i(q_j, p'_j, \dot{q}''_j)\right) \Delta(q_i, v_i, \dot{q}''_i) \\ |A_r(q_i, v_i, \dot{q}''_i)| \delta\left(\phi_{a_1}(q_i, p^i)\right) \exp i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \Big[p'^i(\dot{q}'_i - f_i) + (p''^i - g^i)\dot{q}''_i \\ + L(q_i, v_i, \dot{q}''_i) - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \psi^2(q_i, v_i, \dot{q}''_i) \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{A.18}$$

We now use the standard result

$$dx \delta(f(x)) = dx \sum_i \delta(x - a_i)/|f'(a_i)| \qquad (f(a_i) = 0) \tag{A.19}$$

to write

$$\begin{aligned} Dv_i \delta(v_i - f_i(q_j, p'_j, \dot{q}''_j)) = Dv_i |A_r(q_j, v_j, \dot{q}''_j)| \\ \delta \left(p'^i - \frac{\partial L(q_j, v_j, \dot{q}''_j)}{\partial v_i} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{A.20}$$

Eq. (A.20) serves to convert eq. (A.18) to

$$< \mathrm{out}|\mathrm{in} >= \int Dq_i \Lambda_r((q_i, \dot{q}_i) \exp i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt L(q_i \dot{q}_i) \qquad (A.21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_r(q_i, \dot{q}_i) = \int Dv_i \exp \left[-\frac{i}{2\alpha} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \psi^2(q_i, v_i + \dot{q}_i', \dot{q}_i'') \right] \Delta\left(q_i, v_i + \dot{q}_i', \dot{q}_i''\right) \\ |A_r(q_i, v_i + \dot{q}_i', \dot{q}_i'') \delta \left[\phi_{a_i} \left(q_i, \frac{\partial L(q_j, v_j + \dot{q}_j', \dot{q}_j'')}{\partial v_i} \right), \right. \\ \left. g^i \left(q_i, \frac{\partial L(q_j, v_j + \dot{q}_j', \dot{q}_j'')}{\partial v_i} \right) \right] \qquad (A.22) \\ \exp \left[i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \left(L(q_i, v_i + \dot{q}_i', \dot{q}_i'') - L(q_i, \dot{q}_i', \dot{q}_i'') \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - v_i \frac{\partial L(q_i, v_i + \dot{q}_i', \dot{q}_i'')}{\partial v_i} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

provided we make the shift $v_i \rightarrow v_i + \dot{q}'$.

We are considering how to handle systems (such as a scalar field on a curved background in $2D$ [27]) in which eq. (A.12) does not fix $\mu_{a_1} \dots \mu_{a_{N-1}}$ in terms of μ_{a_N}. We have also yet to examine how a gauge generator found using the approach of ref. [22] can be used in conjunction with eq. (A.10).